UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,567	03/06/2001	Jacob Geil	74200.914	4096

22804 7590 06/23/2005

THE HECKER LAW GROUP
1925 CENTURY PARK EAST
SUITE 2300
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER	
RAMAN, USHA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/800,567	GEIL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Usha Raman	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 March 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed July 16th, 2002 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. No copies or translations have been provided for document number DE-1000451. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.
2. The information disclosure statement filed July 23rd, 2002 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires the following: (1) a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office; (2) U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications listed in a section separately from citations of other documents; (3) the application number of the application in which the information disclosure statement is being submitted on each page of the list; (4) a column that provides a blank space next to each document to be considered, for the examiner's initials; and (5) a heading that clearly indicates that the list is an information disclosure statement. A list of publications to be considered is missing. The information disclosure statement has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-21, 23-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed (US Pat. 3, 944, 943) in view of Parker, "Choosing a Ferrite for Suppression of EMI".

In regards to claims 1 and 21, Reed discloses an apparatus for video insertion loss compensation comprising:

A coaxial cable (12) of predetermined length (see fig. 1)

An analog video input signal transmitted over coaxial cable

A video equalizer having an operational amplifier (10) with feedback circuitry (feedback path 48, see column 4, lines 32-40) comprising a low pass filter (i.e. a filter to achieve the flat response, 22 of figure 2 that passes the lower frequencies and attenuates the higher frequencies) in the feedback circuitry for tailoring broadband response of the operational amplifier to generate a compensated video signal from said input video signal (see column 3, lines 49-52).

An output device for outputting the compensated video signal (see column 3, lines 35-37).

Reed does not disclose that the low pass filter comprises inductive capacitance characteristics at the low frequencies and dissipative at the higher frequencies.

Parker discloses that a ferrite core inductor can be used in conjunction with a capacitor to form a low pass filter (i.e. LC low pass filter) wherein the low pass filter comprises inductive capacitance characteristics at the low frequencies and dissipative at the higher frequencies (see page 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use an LC filter with a ferrite core in order to implement a filter with impedances that are reactive to varying frequencies (see page 3).

In regards to claims 3 and 23, the modified does not disclose that the video signal is a composite video signal.

Examiner takes official notice that it is well known to receive composite video signals (NTSC) over a CATV system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system transmit composite video signals in order to receive various video information (i.e. chrominance luminance), together in a single signal.

In regards to claims 4 and 24, the modified system does not disclose that the analog input video signal is a color component of a color system.

Examiner takes official notice that it is well known to receive a color component of a color system separately as an input video signal (i.e. S-Video signals).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system to receive separate color and luminance components thereby achieving in superior picture clarity.

In regards to claims 5 and 25, X discloses that operational amplifier is of current feedback type (see column 5, lines 20-23, Reed).

In regards to claims 6 and 26, the modified system comprise a the low pass filter has a coil with a ferrite core and at least one winding (at least one winding is required for an inductor).

In regards to claims 7 and 27, the ferrite core has high impedance characteristics at the low to medium frequencies (see page 3, Parker).

In regards to claims 8 and 28, the ferrite core has a size in relation to said predetermined length of said coaxial cable (i.e. size of ferrite core can be used to determine the impedance match the impedance of the coaxial cable. See page 5 of Parker).

In regards to claims 9 and 29, the size of the ferrite core is selected to provide the same insertion loss characteristics over a desired frequency range as the coaxial cable of predetermined length (see column 2, lines 65-67, Reed).

In regards to claims 10 and 30, the frequency range is in the low to medium frequency spectrum of a broadband video signal (see figure 2 of Reed).

In regards to claims 11 and 31, the low pass filter compensates for the low to mid frequency insertion loss of said coaxial cable (see column 2, lines 65-67).

In regards to claims 12 and 32, the apparatus of claim 11, comprises a compensator having a high bandwidth for the high frequency range of the broadband video signal (see column 5, lines 29-50, Reed).

In regards to claims 13 and 33, the compensator for said high frequency range comprises a voltage variable capacitance diode circuit with a variable capacitor for adjusting said bandwidth of the compensator (column 5, lines 41-50, Reed).

In regards to claims 14 and 34, the compensation for high frequency and low to medium frequency range are independently adjustable (high frequency and low frequency components are compensated based on frequency of the signal, therefore the high frequency compensation is "independent" of the low frequency compensation).

In regards to claims 15 and 35, the equalizer is located before the coaxial cable (see figure 1, Reed).

In regards to claims 16 and 36, the equalizer is located after the coaxial cable (see column 3, lines 37-39).

In regards to claims 17, 18, 37, and 38 the ferrite core is partially or fully saturated from a direct current power source (see page 8, Parker).

In regards to claim 19, see claims 1 and 6.

In regards to claim 20, see claims 1, 6, and 7.

5. Claims 2 and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed (US Pat. 3, 944, 943) in view of Parker, "Choosing a Ferrite for Suppression of EMI" as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Imaging Science Foundation, "ISF Wire Specifications for Video Coaxial Cables".

In regards to claims 2 and 22, the modified system does not disclose that the coaxial cable is a high-resolution cable.

ISF recommends using a high-resolution cable with the video-equalizing amplifier when the video is routed over a long length.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Reed to include a high-resolution cable with the video-equalizing amplifier, when routing videos over long length. The motivation is to use a cable type that is susceptible to lower loss over greater lengths.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Usha Raman whose telephone number is (571) 272-7380. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

UR

CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600